

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 Asher Associates, LLC, a Wyoming
7 Limited Liability Corporation,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 Thatcher Eills, an individual; and Does 1-10,
11 inclusive,

12 Defendants.

Case No. 2:25-cv-01136-APG-DJA

Order

13 Before the Court is the parties' disputed discovery plan and scheduling order. (ECF No.
14 23). Plaintiff Asher Associates, LLC, proposes that the Court set a discovery plan consistent with
15 Local Rule 26-1(b). Defendant Thatcher Eills proposes that the Court either stay discovery
16 pending resolution of his motion to dismiss or that the Court only allow limited discovery for
17 sixty days before allowing the parties to proceed with discovery. The Court grants Plaintiff's
18 proposal.

19 Defendant requests that the Court stay discovery, but does not brief the appropriate
20 standard or separately move for that relief. *See Schrader v. Wynn*, No. 2:19-cv-02159-JCM-
21 BNW, 2021 WL 4810324 (D. Nev. Oct. 14, 2021) (outlining the good cause standard for staying
22 discovery); *see Gibson v. MGM Resorts International*, No. 2:23-cv-00140-MMD-DJA, 2023 WL
23 4455726 (D. Nev. July 1, 2023) (explaining that the undersigned magistrate judge has adopted the
24 *Schrader v. Wynn* good cause standard); *see* LR IC 2-2(b) (explaining that, for each type of relief
25 requested or purpose of the document, a separate document must be filed and a separate event
26 must be selected for that document). So, the Court declines to stay discovery at this stage.
27 Alternatively, Defendant asks that the Court impose phased discovery, which form of discovery
28 Defendant argues may "potentially resolv[e] the dispute more efficiently or enabl[e] the Court to


rule on threshold challenges with a complete evidentiary record.” (ECF No. 23 at 3). However, the Court declines to impose phased or bifurcated discovery without very detailed reasoning. This is because, in the Court’s experience, phased or bifurcated discovery often leads to disputes over whether discovery is properly completed in phase one or phase two of discovery. The Court therefore declines to approve Defendant’s proposed discovery plan.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties’ discovery plan and scheduling order (ECF No. 23) is **granted in part and denied in part**. It is denied in part regarding Defendant’s proposed discovery plan. It is granted in part regarding Plaintiff’s proposed discovery plan and the provisions to which the parties agree.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the following deadlines shall govern discovery:

Initial disclosures:	September 19, 2025
Amend pleadings/add parties:	October 15, 2025
Expert disclosures:	November 14, 2025
Rebuttal expert disclosures:	December 15, 2025
Discovery cutoff:	January 13, 2026
Dispositive motions:	February 12, 2026
Pretrial order:	March 16, 2026 ¹

DATED: September 25, 2025



DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ Under Local Rule 26-1(b)(5), if dispositive motions are filed, the deadline for filing the joint pretrial order will be suspended until thirty days after decision on the dispositive motions or further court order.